

C. REMARKS

The Office Action rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. 112 arguing that various elements “lack[] any structure”. In response, claim 1-12 have been amended into method format.

The Office Action has objected to the term “exchange permissions” as vague and indefinite. This objection is respectfully traversed. The term “exchange permissions” is readily understood by one of ordinary skill in the art to mean various levels of permission to access and/or trade on an exchange.

The Office Action has objected to the term “indications” as vague and indefinite. This objection is respectfully traversed. The term “indications” is readily understood by one of ordinary skill in the art. As set forth in paragraph 29 pf the application, “[s]uch open offers and bids are generally referred to as indications of interest, or indications for short.”

The Office Action has requested that the Applicant “state the system and submit any documentation of the system to which he is referring”, presumably in Applicants Response filed 18 December 2006 to the Office Communication of 14 February 2006. In accordance with the establish standards of patentability, Applicant is referring to the proper teaching of the prior art of record as a whole, including the ICTS Symphony product identified by the Office Communication of 14 February 2006.

The Office Action argues that the following is absent from the structural element in the claimed invention: “the presently claimed invention enables a user to cross-trade among a plurality of exchanges.” Independent claims 1 and 44 have been amended to specify that the presently claimed invention is directed to cross-trading among a plurality of exchanges.

The Office Action argues that the following is absent from the structural element in the claimed invention: “a user file that includes exchange permissions corresponding to [multiple] exchanges to which the specified user may access.” Independent claims 1 and 44 have been amended to specify that the presently claimed invention is directed to “user

files . . . containing exchange permissions corresponding to a plurality of exchanges to which the specified user may access”.

The Office Action argues that the following is absent from the structural element in the claimed invention: “commodity-sharing privileges granted between at least two exchanges permitting at least one of the exchanges access to at least one commodity associated with the exchanges.” Directing attention to dependent claim 3, this is traversed.

The Office Action argues that the following is absent from the structural element in the claimed invention: “commodities associated with an exchange are viewed exclusively by users having exchange permissions corresponding to the exchange.” Directing attention to dependent claim 2, this is traversed.

The Office Action argues that the following are absent from the structural elements in the claimed invention: “querying the user database to retrieve exchange permissions from a user file corresponding to the user”, retrieving indications corresponding to the predetermined commodities within the exchanges to which the user has been determined to have access.” Directing attention to the final elements of claim 1 and 44 and the explanation provided above, these are traversed.

The Office Action argues that the following are absent from the structural elements in the claimed invention: “displaying the presentation of the retrieved indications corresponding to the commodities within the exchanges to which the user has been determined to have access”, and “a display for users of the system that permits member users to post and view bids and offers and negotiate and consummate transactions on commodities from one of more exchanges retrieving indications corresponding to the predetermined commodities within the exchanges”. With respect to the first element, directing attention to the final elements of claim 1 and 44 and the explanation provided above, this are traversed. With respect to the second element, new dependant claims 56 and 57 have been added.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims recite patentable subject matter and are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable consideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 17 July 2007

NovusIP, LLC
521 West Superior Street
Suite 221
Chicago, Illinois 60610-3135
312.664.0906 p
312.664.0963 f
pschaafsma@novusip.com

By 

Paul E. Schaafsma
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 32,664